

REMARKS

If the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner is urged to telephone Edward M. Fink, Esq. at 732-563-0440 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Amendments

Claims 51-90 are presently in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 51-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

The issues pertaining to indefiniteness in claim 51 and the improper Markush language appearing in claims 53-58 have been resolved by the foregoing amendments to the claims. Similarly, claim 82 has been amended to eliminate the unacceptable phrase.

Accordingly, the 112 rejections are believed to have been obviated by the amendments to the claims and it is urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 51-80 and 83-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arentsen et al. The Examiner urges that Arentsen et al disclose or suggest the use of a softener, such as water, the use of a coating, the use of masses having different properties, the use of fillers and the use of a colorant. The Examiner also notes that it is known to form natural polymer products having a hinge and to provide molding masses with surfactants to adjust surface tension. The various rejections have been considered and are traversed as follows:

In reviewing the disclosure of Arentsen et al and the examples it is apparent that only one mass is employed for forming the entire product wherein the product design, for example having voids and different wall thicknesses is used for obtaining different product parts. With reference to page 39, line 6, reference is made to combinations of granulate materials but they are mixed into one mass. This is evident from the preceding parts of the same paragraph which discloses that separation of these combined granulate materials and fillers should be prevented, a step which often is not easy. The inserts alluded to on the same page at line 18 and 19 are for example metal parts and the like around which the single mass is injected to obtain a product fully encompassing the insert. This clearly would lead one skilled in the art away from using different masses for forming different parts of the product in the same mold cavity during the same process.

The Examiner furthermore has not provided any substantiation for the conclusion that it would be obvious to use two masses to form different parts of products, starting with the concept that an insert might be provided in a product. Commonly known inserts are employed in, for example, plastic products, for providing attachment means such as screw threads, magnets, insertion holes and the like which are always made of a rigid material such as metal. Furthermore, the term "insert" clearly defines that this is placed in a mold cavity or prior to introduction of the molding material, since otherwise it would not be an insert but an integral part of the product formed at the same time.

Accordingly, the term "insert" would point away from integral forming from different masses as claimed in the instant application. Similarly, since the separation of granules is an issue defined by Arentsen et al, this can only be the case if the granules are at first mixed (as would be the fillers). It is evident that the patentees teach that care should be taken that these granules and fillers do not separate, thereby disclosing the desire to use one single, homogeneous mass. Once again, this clearly leads away from applicant's disclosure of using two different masses in the same mold cavity to form different parts of the same product. Accordingly, it is urged that the patentees do not disclose or teach one skilled in the art the concept claimed by applicant herein or render the concept obvious and it is urged that the rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/809,002
Amdt. dated June 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of Dec. 5, 2005

Conclusion

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 51-90 are most earnestly solicited. The Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 5, 2006


Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney
Reg. No. 30,090
Customer No. 007625
(732) 542-7800

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES
Counselors at Law
P. O. Box 8489
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701-8489

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on June 5, 2006 with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Signature 30,090

Reg. No.